

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, and 12-28 remain for examination. Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that allowable subject matter is contained in claims 12-29.

Interview:

The examiner is thanked for the courtesy extended during the interview held on July 22, 2004 which the claims, the prior art applied reference and modified claim language was discussed.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-2, 4 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Arai (5,517,551).

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 1 is anticipated by Arai since Arai discloses that each extension telephone number has a different line key (118) set for the plurality of extension numbers respectively. The Examiner points to column 2, lines 31-46, column 4, lines 11-24 and to Figures 1, 4 and 5A-C as well as Figures 7-8. In the "Response to Argument" section of the office action, the examiner points to column 3, lines 17-20 of Arai. This latter section of Arai was also discussed during the telephone interview.

As pointed out in the prior reply, the Examiner's reference to the plurality of extension numbers 103-105 refers to the extension telephones in Figure 1 of Arai. Applicant's invention, however, is specifically directed to mobile units and thus would presumably correspond to the mobile units 109-114 not to the extension telephones 103-105. Moreover, while Arai teaches that a plurality of extension numbers are present for the plurality of extension telephones and fixed units (fixed units 106, and 107) Arai shows that each mobile unit only has a single speech button 312 as well as a keypad 309 for inputting the outgoing call number. The speech button 312 is also utilized to receive a call as explained in

the flow chart in Figure 7 and in column 4 beginning at line 10. The display unit 311 of Arai is simply that, namely a display and is not a plurality of keys.

As pointed out during the interview, the simplest way to understand the differences between applicant's invention and the Arai reference is to compare applicant's Figure 2 with Arai's Figure 4. Applicant's Figure 2 shows a plurality of line keys 12 which is notably absent in Figure 4 of Arai. The line keys 12 are not to be confused with the display 15 of applicant which is also shown in Figure 2. In contrast, Arai merely has a display 311 and does not have any line keys unless the speech button 312 could be considered a single line key. Further, as pointed out during the interview, the discussion in Arai at column 3, lines 17-20 merely indicate that for an incoming call, the mobile unit will be able to display the extension number on the display 311. Displaying the extension number on a display is quite a different thing than providing a plurality of physically present line keys on the mobile unit.

As discussed during the interview, and in an attempt to even more clearly recite applicant's invention, applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 4 to recited that the like keys are for selecting among any one of said plurality of extension numbers. Without making a firm commitment, the examiner indicated that such language would help to distinguish applicant's claims over the prior art. Thus, the current amendment emphasizes the importance of the line keys by reciting their operational purpose in selecting any of the plurality of extension numbers. This language is deemed to even more clearly differentiate applicant's invention from the applied prior art.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every claimed limitation. This is certainly not the case here since, as indicated above, the prior art does not disclose the plurality of different line keys physically present on the mobile station for selecting among any one of said plurality of extension numbers. Thus, the Sec. 102 rejection must be withdrawn.

Conclusions

In view of the arguments set forth above and the amendments made hereto, it is submitted that applicant's claims readily distinguish over the applied prior art and that the section 102 rejection must be withdrawn.

Moreover, applicant's dependent claims contain additional limitations and further limit the recitations of independent claims 1 and 4 from which they depend. Thus, there dependent claims are likewise deemed allowable.

The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned (310-975-7895) to discuss any issues that would expedite prosecution of the application.


The Application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 15, 2004

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257